1 2 3 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT 4 WESTERN DISTRICT OF WASHINGTON AT TACOMA 5 6 ALLAN ROBINSON, 7 **CASE NO. C12-6064 BHS** Plaintiff, 8 ORDER DENYING PLAINTIFF'S v. MOTION TO PROCEED IN 9 FORMA PAUPERIS CITY OF RAYMOND, et al., 10 Defendants. 11 12 This matter comes before the Court on a motion to proceed in forma pauperis filed 13 on December 14, 2012 by Allan Robinson ("Robinson") (Dkt. 1), along with his 14 complaint (Dkt. 1-1). The Court has considered the pleadings filed in support of the 15 motion and the remainder of the file and hereby denies the motion for the reasons stated 16 herein. 17 The district court may permit indigent litigants to proceed in forma pauperis upon 18 completion of a proper affidavit of indigency. See 28 U.S.C. § 1915(a). However, the 19 "privilege of pleading in forma pauperis . . . in civil actions for damages should be 20 allowed only in exceptional circumstances." Wilborn v. Escalderon, 789 F.2d 1328 (9th 21 Cir. 1986). Moreover, the court has broad discretion in denying an application to proceed 22

in forma pauperis. Weller v. Dickson, 314 F.2d 598 (9th Cir. 1963), cert. denied, 375 U.S. 845 (1963).

In Robinson's application to proceed in forma pauperis, while he states his checking account is over-drawn, he reports his household annual income for the last twelve months as \$41,100.00, from monthly benefits received from disability, unemployment workers compensation or other public assistance. Dkt. 1 at 1. Although it is not clear whether he continues to receive those monthly benefits, he does indicate that he speaks with the Veteran Affairs Office and Social Security Administration monthly. *See id.* at 2. Additionally, Robinson's application indicates that he received a settlement of \$5,000 for a vehicle accident within the last twelve months, and he owns a car worth \$875.00. *Id.* Based on this information, the Court, in its discretion, determines that Robinson does not qualify for in forma pauperis status. However, if Robinson wishes to proceed with his lawsuit, he must pay the required filing fee.

Notwithstanding the Court's determination that Robinson may proceed if he pays the filing fee, the Court notes that after a review of his complaint, the facts as alleged fail to state a 42 U.S.C. § 1983 claim. Additionally, it appears that while Robinson alleges a Freedom of Information Act violation, no facts indicate a basis for that cause of action, as he sought documents or information from Washington State entities. Requests for information made to the State of Washington are governed by RCW 42.56, et seq., and violations thereof would likely form the basis of a state claim to be adjudicated in state, not federal, court.

Dated this 20th day of December, 2012.

BENJAMIN H. SETTLE United States District Judge